

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

## **Funding Provided by:**

California Department of Water Resources,  
Natalia Deardorff, Project Manager

## **Central OC IRCWM Plan Prepared by:**

Bob Stein, City of Newport Beach  
*Project Manager, Writer*

Krista Sloniowski, Connective Issue  
*Plan Architect, Lead Writer*

Nancy Heuler  
*Writer, Copy Editor, Graphics*

William Whittenberg, Dudek  
*Project Figures, Prioritization*

Lorraine Hornby, Expression Graphic Design  
*Graphic Artist, Layout*

## **Agency Liaisons:**

Carolyn Schaffer, County of Orange RDMD  
*Orange County Watersheds Liaison*

Mark Tettemer, IRWD  
*Irvine Ranch Water District Liaison*

Central OC IRCWM Plan Focus Group

## **Plan Reviewers:**

Special thanks to the following people who participated in reviewing the plan through focus group meetings or provided written comments to the draft document. Written comments can be found in Appendix M.

Jack H. Gregg, California Coastal Commission

Steve McMasters, State Water Resources Control Board

Mark Adelson, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board

Erinn Wilson, California Department of Fish and Game

Jeff Stoddard, California Department of Fish and Game

Carolyn Schaffer, County of Orange, OC Watersheds Program

Mary Anne Skorpanich, County of Orange,  
OC Watersheds Program

Marilyn Thoms, County of Orange, OC Watersheds Program

Amanda Carr, OC Stormwater Program

Marsha Westropp, Orange County Water District

Michele Farmer, Orange County Sanitation District

Brent Galyon, Municipal Water District of Orange County

Mike Granada, Orange County Flood Control District

Dr. Geremew Amenu, Los Angeles County  
Department of Public Works

Mark Tettemer, Irvine Ranch Water District

Mike Loving, City of Irvine

Robert L. Woodings, City of Lake Forest

David Webb, City of Newport Beach

Dave Kiff, City of Newport Beach

Iris Lee, City of Newport Beach

Joe Palco, City of Santa Ana

Taig Higgins, City of Santa Ana

Alex Waite, City of Tustin

Dr. Peter Bowler, University of California, Irvine

Dr. William L. Bretz, University of California, Irvine

Roger Mallett, Newport Bay Naturalists and Friends

Irwin Haydock, Newport Bay Naturalists and Friends

Dennis Baker, Newport Bay Naturalists and Friends

Jack Keating, Newport Bay Naturalists and Friends

### **Central OC IRCWM Plan – Stakeholder Meeting Participants:**

County of Orange

City of Costa Mesa

City of Irvine

City of Laguna Hills

City of Laguna Woods

City of Lake Forest

City of Newport Beach

City of Orange

City of Santa Ana

City of Tustin

Orange County Flood Control District

Irvine Ranch Water District

Mesa Consolidated Water District

Municipal Water District of Orange County

Orange County Water District

Orange County Sanitation District

Orange County Vector Control District

California Department of Fish and Game

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board

The Irvine Company

Connective Issue

Dudek

Fusco Engineering

Nossaman, Gunther, Knox, Elliott, LLP

RBF Consulting

Recupero and Associates

S4S, Inc.

Weston Solutions

Newport Bay Naturalists and Friends

Stop Polluting Our Newport

Environmental Coalition for the Great Park

Friends of Harbors, Beaches and Parks

Nature Reserve of Orange County

Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project

Orange County Coastkeeper

Surfrider Foundation

The Great Park Corporation

UC Irvine

UC Cooperative Extension – South Coast Research Station

# FOREWORD — JULY 8, 2009

This Integrated Regional and Coastal Water Management Plan (IRCWMP) — Phase 2, was completed in October 2008 and was greeted with three points of view: those that supported it, those that preferred a return to a traditional approach, and those that questioned if the integrated, regional planning approach really is worth all the effort. There was general agreement among all parties on the list of top prioritized projects (see Appendix A). The most important concerns centered around the proposed regional performance objectives, agency responsibilities for moving each project forward, and the need to make the IRCWMP simpler and more linear. Stakeholder comments are included in Appendix M, available at [www.newportbeachca.gov/index.aspx?page=1333](http://www.newportbeachca.gov/index.aspx?page=1333).

Since the release of the Phase 2 IRCWMP, numerous meetings among the agencies and other concerned parties are still searching for the common ground. The most important development has occurred in the past month with the Central Orange County Executive Watershed Committee expressing interest in revisiting the idea of developing quantitative regional performance objectives for our water resources, something that has been rarely attempted for a highly urbanized watershed.

This new edition of the Phase 2 IRCWMP, while essentially unchanged, now includes the Acknowledgements Section. It also

includes a copy of all stakeholder comments received since October 2008 (Appendix M). Aside from filling in missing information, correcting grammatical errors and tightening up the prose style, the only significant change in the text is in **Chapter 10: Project Integration**. This chapter is the guts of the plan as it lists priority and supporting projects for each Planning Area. In this new edition, Table 10.1, Key Projects for Each Planning Area, has been added. This table shows key projects for each of the six planning areas, broken down by the four water resource areas (hydrology/flood control, water quality, water supply, and habitat). Section 10.5 (Bay/Coastal Planning Area) has been supplemented to list additional local objectives and key projects, along with callouts that show the inter-linkages among projects.

Resolution of the remaining Plan deficiencies will have to be addressed in the next phase of the IRCWMP. Once quantitative performance objectives are formulated and approved by the Watershed Executive Committee, project prioritization scoring can be revised to reflect these performance objectives. The following text is from the original Foreword.

This Plan's primary purpose is to serve as a planning tool to effectively manage this region's water resources. To fulfill this purpose, the Plan establishes goals and objectives, identifies water

resource projects, discusses ways to integrate a proposed project with other projects, and prioritizes projects on a regional basis. It is intended to have a regional perspective and to further develop the relationships and spirit of collaboration that exists in this watershed. This plan may also be used by local agencies to pursue grant funds from programs that require consistency with an adopted IRWM plan. Although the Plan has no regulatory authority, the State will expect that local agency stakeholders will formally adopt or accept it by board/council resolution.

Based on stakeholder comments, this Plan has been reformatted, extensively revised and now includes:

1. A Plan description that shows a strong nexus between this Plan and statewide priorities (Chapter 1)
2. An expanded chapter describing the Region (Chapter 3)
3. An expanded explanation on integrating projects (Chapter 4)
4. Regional Performance Objectives (Chapters 6, 7 and 8)
5. Specific project examples throughout the Region to establish a healthy and self-sustaining hydrologic system (Chapter 10)
6. A revised project scoring methodology tied to state priority issues (Chapter 11)

The plan process, the Dynamic Planning Approach, has been more tightly defined and a clearer explanation provided, and the tone of the plan has been revised to be more positive and goal directed.

More photos and diagrams have been included and the bibliography has been expanded significantly.

While some effort has been made to keep this Plan compact, it is not a document that can be read in a single sitting. As a first pass, the reader may wish to first read the Executive Statement, then take a look at Figure 2.4 which shows the Plan's Principles, Vision, Mission and Goals. The 4-box figure in Figure 4.1, Dynamic Planning Approach, depicts how regional and local objectives inter-relate with Integration and Prioritization tasks. The sections following this figure provide useful explanations of this process. Then flip to Appendix A which lists project scores and rankings for over 130 water resource projects. The scoring process is described in Chapter 11.